NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555



April 16, 1991

The Honorable Edward J. Markey United States House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Markey:

I am responding to your letter of February 28, 1991, in which you expressed support for upgrading the physical security at U.S. nuclear power reactors licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). In addition, you requested the Commission to reverse the January 15, 1991 denial of a request for emergency implementation of vehicle bomb contingency plans at power reactors. Finally, your letter presented a number of questions which are answered in Enclosure 1.

As noted in the Commission's February 14, 1991 letter to you, the Petition for Rulemaking is receiving full review and consideration in an expedited manner. We will, of course, provide you with the results upon completion of the review. The public comment period closed on February 28, 1991, and 26 comments were received as of that date. Your personal views will also be considered as part of this process.

As you may recall, current threat statements were based on extensive study and interaction with other Federal agencies regarding potential threats to licensed facilities. Throughout the formative stages of the threat statements and since their promulgation, the NRC has pursued factual information upon which to base its consideration of the potential threat to licensed facilities. A thorough understanding of demonstrated adversary characteristics directs the staff's understanding of the threat environment, domestic and foreign. That environment deliberations of the threat environment, domestic and foreign. That environment is continually reviewed by staff for any change that might require a modification to the NRC design basis threat statements, and, consequently, to safeguards tion to the NRC design basis threat statements, and, consequently, to safeguards to NRC licensed facilities had been identified. If such a threat is identified, we would take prompt, appropriate action.

In response to the petitioner's Request for Emergency Action, the NRC declined to activate contingency plans to protect reactors against truck bombs based on the ongoing assessment of the worldwide threat environment. (See March 4, 1991 letter to petitioner's counsel at Enclosure 2.) At the time of your request for consideration, this assessment was unchanged and thus we have taken no action on your request. The Commission will not hesitate to require implementation of contingency plans should the situation warrant, and is confident that tation of contingency plans should the purpose for which they were intended.

I want to assure you that, although the armed conflict in the Persian Gulf has ended, we will not reduce our continued vigilance. Specifically, the NRC will continue to closely monitor developments worldwide, particularly in the Middle continue to closely monitor developments. East, and if the situation warrants, the NRC is prepared to take appropriate action.

Sincerely, gum R. Letin

James R. Curtiss Acting Chairman

Enclosures:

Responses to Questions

Letter from Chilk to Greenberg 2. dtd 3/4/91

> [Full responses to questions and supporting documents may be obtained from Rep. Markey's office.]